

REMARKS

Amendments to the abstract

The applicant has amended the abstract in response to the examiner's objection. **Section 103 rejection**

The examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 6 as being rendered obvious by *Ichihara* (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,937) and *Dunn* (U.S. Patent 6,701,439).

Both *Dunn* and the claimed invention seek to enhance security. However, they do so in different ways. *Dunn* discloses securing a *data network* against *hackers* by impeding, discouraging, and/or imposing surveillance on the hacker (col. 6, lines 26-27), and reporting the unauthorized access to the authorities and to the operators of the data network (col. 6, lines 27-38). The claimed invention, by contrast, secures a *database* by changing a stored password hash value in the event the *database administrator* attempts to impersonate a user. Thus, *Dunn* protects against *external* threats by alerting the authorities and the network operator, while the claimed invention protects against *internal* threats by calculating a new password hash value and replacing the stored password hash value with the new password hash value.

Claims 1 and 6 require a trigger triggering an action "when an administrator alters said table through a database management system (DBMS) for said database." The examiner stated that this element would be obvious in view of *Dunn* (col. 5 lines 56-67 and col. 6 lines 23-45). But neither *Dunn* nor *Ichihara* discloses triggering an action in response to a database administrator altering a table through a DBMS.

As the examiner observed, *Dunn* discloses the use of "fraud detection and nuisance reporting features of the telecommunications switch [to] impede, discourage, and/or surveil the unauthorized entity." (col 6, lines 23-27). As *Dunn* explains, fraud detection and nuisance reporting involve locating an *intruding user* and reporting that user's presence to both the police and, optionally, to the operators of the data network. (col. 6, lines 27-38). But the claimed invention is intended to protect against an *insider*, i.e., the database administrator, who attempts to impersonate a user. Unlike *Dunn*, the claimed invention does not specify that the authorities or the operator of the database are to be notified. Indeed, it would appear almost futile to protect

Applicant :
Serial No. : 09/725,005
Filed : November 29, 2000
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 17299-007001


against intrusion by notifying the intruder, the database operator, that an intrusion is taking place. It would be similarly futile to notify the authorities that a database administrator has altered a table in a database.

The remainder of the claims depend on claim 1 and contain all of its limitations. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable.

Now pending are claims 1-6, of which claims 1 and 6 are independent. Enclosed is a \$980.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/19/04



Thomas A. Brown
Reg. No. 54,619

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906